

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SAEID SAM KANGARLOU,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
ALTON AL LOCKLEAR, et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:18-cv-02286-JAD-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 110]

Pending before the Court is Defendants' motion for an order that Plaintiff must appear for deposition. Docket No. 110. Plaintiff filed a response, indicating that he does not object to appearing for a deposition in the future. Docket No. 111 at 8; *see also id.* at 19.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to appear for deposition by September 27, 2023. **FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.** *E.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b). The parties must immediately confer on a date, time, and place for the deposition. The deposition must be taken in person.<sup>2</sup>

Defendants' motion is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 25, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> Given Plaintiff's agreement to be deposed moving forward, the Court need not resolve the other issues raised by Plaintiff.

<sup>2</sup> Remote depositions are permitted when the parties stipulate or the Court so orders. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(4). Plaintiff has not agreed to a remote deposition and Defendants have not provided the showing necessary for an order requiring one. Even were Defendants to try to make such a showing in reply, moreover, the Court would not entertain that argument. *See Brand v. Kijakazi*, 575 F. Supp. 3d 1265, 1273 (D. Nev. 2021).